



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
09/417,386	10/13/99	ROTHBERG	J 15966-539

HM22/0717  
MINTZ LEVIN COHN FERRIS GLOVSKY POPECO  
ONE FINANCIAL CENTER  
BOSTON MA 02111

EXAMINER

TAYLOR, J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1656

DATE MAILED: 07/17/00

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

**Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks**

# Office Action Summary

Application No.  
09/417,386

Applicant(s)

Rothberg et al.

Examiner

Janell Taylor

Group Art Unit  
1656



☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Mar 7, 2000

☐ This action is FINAL.

☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, **prosecution as to the merits is closed** in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 35 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 1 month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

## Disposition of Claim

☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are pending in the application

Of the above, claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration

☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are rejected.

☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

☒ Claims 1-26 are subject to restriction or election requirement.

## Application Papers

☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.

☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

☐ All ☐ Some\* ☒ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been

☐ received.

☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) \_\_\_\_\_

☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\*Certified copies not received: \_\_\_\_\_

☒ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

## Attachment(s)

☐ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892

☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_

☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413

☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

— SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES —

Art Unit: 1653

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Election/Restriction*

1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
  - I. Claims 1-20, drawn to a method of screening a population of nucleic acids for a novel sequence, classified in class 435, subclass 6.
  - II. Claims 21-26, drawn to a method for producing a population of nucleic acid molecules enriched for 5' regions of mRNA molecules, classified in class 435, subclass 91.51.
2. The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions I and II are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the different inventions are not related because one is a method of screening, resulting in the identification of a nucleic acid sequence and the comparison of that sequence to a reference sequence; and the other invention is a method for producing a population of nucleic acid molecules, starting with RNA molecules and resulting in the formation of a cDNA molecule.
3. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Art Unit: 1653

4. A telephone call was made to Shelby Walker on July 3, 2000 to request an oral election to the above restriction requirement, but did not result in an election being made.


Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).

5. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a petition under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Janell Taylor whose telephone number is (703) 305-0273.

Janell Taylor

July 13, 2000

  
W. Gary Jones  
Supervisory Patent Examiner  
Technology Center 1600  
7/14/00